1	18b9canMS
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	х
4	CAN'T STOP PRODUCTIONS, INC.,
5	Plaintiff,
6	v. 17 Civ. 6513(CS)(LMS) Status Conference
7	SIXUVUS, LTD., et al.,
8	Defendants.
9	x
10	White Plains, New York
11	November 9, 2018
12	Before:
13	THE HONORABLE LISA MARGARET SMITH,
14	Magistrate Judge
	APPEARANCES
15	EISENBERG TANCHUM & LEVY
16	Attorneys for Plaintiff STEWART L. LEVY
17	SIEWEKI II. IEVI
18	ADELMAN MATZ P.C.
19	Attorneys for Defendants except Felipe Rose GARY P. ADELMAN
20	
21	HILL WALLACK Attorneys for Defendant Felipe Rose ERIC I. ABRAHAM
22	RICHARD A. CATALINA, JR.
23	WADEN LITTER To be seen a see
24	KAREN WILLIS, Intervenor
25	

1	Digital recording.
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

THE DEPUTY CLERK: In the matter of Can't Stop		
Productions, Inc., versus Sixuvus, Limited, et al.		
Counsel, please note your appearance for the record.		
MR. LEVY: I'm Stewart Levy, of the firm Eisenberg,		
Tanchum & Levy, with Can't Stop, the plaintiff.		
MR. ADELMAN: Gary Adelman for all of the defendants,		
except Felipe Rose.		
And sitting with me is non-admitted, but passed the		
bar, Briana Thomas, who will not be speaking today.		
Thank you.		
MS. WILLIS: Karen Willis, intervenor.		
THE COURT: Mr. Abraham, can you hear us?		
MR. ABRAHAM: Yes, I can.		
Thank you very much.		
THE COURT: All right. You need to state your		
appearance.		
MR. ABRAHAM: Thank you.		
This is Eric Abraham, on behalf of Felipe Rose. I'm		
from the law firm Hill Wallack, in Princeton, New Jersey.		
And with me on the phone is Richard Catalina from my		
firm.		
And I'd like to thank the Court for accommodating us		
by allowing us to call in.		
THE COURT: All right. As you know, there's a motion		
pending before the Court for a determination of whether there's		

an enforceable settlement. An issue has arisen about an alleged violation of at least the spirit of that prospective settlement.

I need to tell you right up front, I only have a limited amount of time today. I'm not intending to spend all day on this matter. So I'm willing to hear all of you.

The one, frankly, major concern that I have is that even if there were to have been a violation of the settlement, I don't see that there's any element of the settlement agreement which identifies what the consequences of such a breach would be, which, of course, is something of a concern.

But I don't know who wants to be heard first.

MR. LEVY: Well, your Honor, if I may, I wrote the letter to get this started.

I just thought I would take advantage of the fact that because the motion is pending, there's continuing jurisdiction of the Court. And we obviously want this to end and (unintelligible) as possible. And it just seems to me that whether the Court finds there's a binding settlement agreement or if there isn't, we're still going to have issues come up. And I'd like it that when we have -- when this case is finally over, it's finally over. So I thought -- when we saw these two concerts, we didn't write -- Ken Starr didn't write into the Court and say -- seek an order to show cause or a stay or ask for damages. We don't ask for damages or anything in the

letter.

But what I ask in the letter is, maybe, since we see -- here's -- here is the Sixuvus group in practice -- giving them the benefit, they are trying to comply with what they think are the terms of the settlement. And in practice, this is what it looks like. And there may be things, for example, on the second TV show where the announcers introduce them as the Village People, and they don't -- so they would say, "Hey, we can't stop that." You know, it can all be both ways. There's a ten-minute speech in German which he explains on the first concert that the name was taken away, and maybe that should be part of the act in English, too.

All I was thinking was: Hey, this is a great opportunity, while we have continuing jurisdiction is, put aside for today the legality. Is there a settlement agreement or there isn't. Or if there's a settlement agreement, we still have issues, as you just appointed out: What are the damages? What do we do? What, we go to court every week?

So I thought: Okay. Here are two (unintelligible) instances. If Ms. Willis has instances of anything else, bring it to everyone's attention now and say maybe we should deal with this now. We might facilitate this (unintelligible) issue.

So that's -- our point was just to throw ourselves on the Court and say maybe this is a good opportunity and bring us

close to a settlement.

THE COURT: Mr. Levy -- Mr. Adelman. I'm sorry.

MR. ADELMAN: Thank you, your Honor.

So I agree with Mr. Levy that I'd like this to end.

I would like to say that my clients worked hard as hard. And of two videos that were presented by Mr. Levy, which only represent a portion of the shows that they've done, I would like to address the first video briefly, which is, if you go through the settlement transcript, not only did my clients comply with it, but they over-complied with it. They wore the costumes that they're allowed to for less time than they're allowed to. They sung less than 50 percent of the songs that they're allowed to. They're allowed to sing 55 percent. And they came up with an act that does not open with Village People anything. In fact, I think they did it quite creatively.

There's no violation of the settlement agreement there. There's no iota of it. It's within the spirit, and it's within the terms.

I just think that when the intervenor saw the video, she didn't like it. She's the only person here that did not -- that opposed the settlement agreement being signed.

I'm not sure -- I haven't read the whole settlement agreement. I'm not sure what the consequences are if either side violates the settlement agreement. And the other side can violate it, as well, I might add.

I will say that I thought, since this was the first couple of months of my client's putting their show together, that if either party had an objection to anything that they were doing, that I would get a call or a letter describing what their objections were. In fact, even the letter that Mr. Levy sent doesn't even accurately -- I mean, doesn't specifically describe what the problem is.

That's the first thing.

Just to quickly address the announcers, if you watch the video, the last thing -- I mean -- and I don't speak

German, so I don't know what they were saying prior to that.

But the last thing they did say were -- was, "The Kings of Disco, former members of Village People," exactly the way they're supposed to.

If there are some issues that need to be resolved, that's what I'm here to do. But I think putting aside whether the settlement agreement, the legal issues, as far as the settlement agreement -- settlement transcript is enforceable or not, in Mr. Levy's letter, he said, either the settlement transcript is enforceable and therefore is a violation -- we don't believe there's any violations -- or the settlement agreement is not enforceable and it's an infringement. For that, you don't even believe that it's an infringement.

So I'm happy to discuss the issues, but at the same time, I'm very well versed in the trademark law. I understand

what my clients can and cannot do. Their sole purpose is to follow the spirit and the guidelines of the settlement agreement, and have done so.

And you know, adding to that, I'm not -- again, I don't speak German, and I don't pretend to know German law. So I will end on that. But I am amenable to hearing if the -- you know, if there are issues, and I'll happily respond to them one by one.

I also have my own issues with the intervenor's group and things that they have done, though I thought over the last four months that she was so quiet, why make a big deal about this; everybody's doing what they're supposed to do.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Abraham, do you want to be heard?

MR. ABRAHAM: Only to speak, your Honor, what I think

all parties know, which is that Mr. Rose has resigned from

Sixuvus. He's informed Kings of Disco that he no longer will

be continuing as a member. So you know, I hate to say we don't

really take a position, but in many respects, Judge, we don't

take a position.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Willis?

MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, here's why I've never agreed to go along with this is because --

THE COURT: That's just wrong. Numerous places in the transcript, you agreed to the various portions of the

agreement. So I grant you that since then, you have declined to sign off on any agreement, but in the settlement transcript, there are repeated instances where you affirmatively said, "We have an agreement."

So I'm just correcting what you just said. I know you're not happy now, and that's what I want to hear about, what's your position now.

MS. WILLIS: Well, I must correct your Honor. Your Honor, in the transcript, time and time again, you hear an agreement to agree. And the Second Circuit has made it very clear that an agreement to agree is just not enforceable. But I don't -- you know, I don't want to get caught up in this right now.

But yes, there's an agreement to agree. That's where we are. Your Honor, begging, this is why I really have not gone along with this, because who's interested in coming here? I'm not interested in having to come into the court and argue about whether or not they've gone beyond. I don't want them doing it. They can't do it, and they're out there blatantly dressing as Village People. Nowhere in the settlement did I agree that they can even do television shows, by the way. In fact, that was something that was discussed, that they could not. We would not grant them that right.

But not only on the television show, your Honor, where they were introduced as Village People, when the show closed, they again stated, "Village People."

I have seen their show, and it's not something that we've agreed to at all, because what they've done is, as a part of their show, your Honor, they simply say, "You know, look. We're doing a couple of songs here, but now let's get down to who we really are. And here's who we are. We're the original boy band who is the Village People." And that's what they've been doing. And that's completely passing off themselves as Village People.

They also do it all over their Facebook pages. They make these statements about, you know, that they are, you know, Village People.

So this is blatant trademark infringement. It is not covered under their -- under the settlement that they believe they had. And nowhere in the language of the alleged agreement did we say they could actually decide to simply pick a portion of the show and present it. Well, guess what portion of their show that they've selected? For the television show, they selected the Village People portion. Okay? They performed as Village People, and nothing else. They performed all the Village People songs. They do the YMCA dance.

Your Honor, I'm just not going to tolerate it. I'm not putting up with this. No, this is -- I don't want to be here. These are the games they like to play. I'm not interested. This is a blatant violation even of the agreement

that they say we have, which we don't. If I was, what are we doing here? They're no longer the Village People. They want to present themselves that way. They can't accept reality, that they must move on.

And so that's where we are. They have blatantly violated it, even the agreement that they propose to have.

THE COURT: Mr. Levy -- Mr. Adelman.

MR. ADELMAN: Okay. I mean, as far as I'm concerned, that's just talk. If you look at the video, you will see exactly what they did. They don't dress -- they do exactly what the settlement transcript asks them to do, the way the settlement transcript is set up to do. They clearly -- they make it very clear that they are not the Village People anymore. No one, if you compare --

Can I have the pictures?

If you compare the side-by-side of the modified outfits that were agreed upon and what Ms. Willis's Village People group wear, you will see a great distinction.

I must add that, again, the intervenor doesn't come into court with entirely clean hands. If you look on the front page of her Facebook page, underneath a picture of her group performing, Victor Willis says, "Village People show why they are truly the Kings of Disco, Capital 'K,' Capital 'D,' and always have been." That's very recent: October 22nd, 12:46 p.m.

That, I might add, is a violation of my client's trademark rights, "Capital 'K,' Capital 'D,'" and "Kings of Disco."

The sole purpose of Ms. Willis's goal here is to shut down my client. And my client has gone through great strides. And I could take the video from their first German show with you and go through it screen by screen and show you exactly why it fits within the settlement transcript and the spirit of the agreement. I doubt that the intervenor or the plaintiff has even attempted to do that.

As for what the folks that introduced them and called them out said, we're right. While we tell them, and they said, "Kings of Disco, former members of the Village People," we can't stop them in mid-sentence. What we can tell them -- but I don't think anybody at that show thought that they were the Village People.

The second point I might add is, I noticed that in Mr. Levy's letter, he doesn't say anything about how my clients have been marketed or, you know, how they put themselves out there, which is the real key to this whole thing, to a certain degree. Because the fans are coming to see Kings of Disco, former members of Village People. The show they put on is Kings of Disco, former members of Village People.

I might add, since -- I mean, I don't know where any of this is going, but I believe, under current U.S. law, that

my clients are actually agreeing in their transcript to less than what they could actually do. They have happily been doing it the way they're doing it so they can move past their prior role as the Village People and their new role as the Kings of Disco.

You know, like I said, any issue that the plaintiff or the intervenor has, I am prepared to address. If there is something that deviates from the settlement transcript, we can fix it.

For instance, very happy for my clients, when they go on stage, to announce that they are the Kings of Disco. Seems like a very easy fix, no matter what the announcers say.

That's the first thing.

The second thing is, I don't see anything in the transcript agreement that limits their rights to appear on TV, which, by the way, that TV program was three hours long and had multiple, multiple acts. And the plaintiff has just cut out—and it was—my client's performance was five minutes and twenty—less than five minutes, I think, which, you know, is maybe something we can talk about, because we never talked about shows that are less than five minutes. What we talked about is three-song shows. This TV appearance, in particular, actually starts with them in track suits singing a non-Village People song for, I think, a little bit of time. And then they go into the modified uniforms and sing a medley of three

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

your Honor.

Village People songs. If that has to be addressed or modified because the parties can agree it does or does not fit within the settlement agreement, then we should have a conversation about it, not a court appearance or an order to show cause. MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, in response --MR. ADELMAN: That's how I -- that's my personal opinion. MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, in response to Mr. Adelman's point, first of all, his clients don't have a valid trademark of Kings of Disco, and never will. That's not an issue here. THE COURT: MS. WILLIS: No. Your Honor, he brought it up, so I'm responding. Is that okay? THE COURT: All right. MS. WILLIS: Thank you, your Honor. Now --THE COURT: You know, Ms. Willis, I appreciate that Mr. Levy has a bad knee. But I haven't heard that you do. Mr. Adelman stood up. It's the appropriate way to show respect for the Court. Is there a reason why you can't stand up? MS. WILLIS: Well, I was really trying to show respect for Mr. Levy. We're on the same table here. But I'll stand,

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. WILLIS: No problem.

Your Honor, there is no valid Kings of Disco trademark, and there should not be, if I have anything to do with it, number one.

Number two, is Mr. Adelman here with a straight face to say that the "Kings of Disco" is not a moniker of the Village People? It is. We can prove it.

So the Village People --

THE COURT: I'm completely boggled, Ms. Willis. The previous discussion that went on for a very long time on March 28th of this year at length discussed the Kings of Disco as an alternative entity. And I didn't hear any of this from you then at all. I've re-read the entire transcript this morning. There's no discussion on your part of, "They can't use 'Kings of Disco.'" In fact, that was precisely what was agreed to.

MS. WILLIS: Well, your Honor, you need to only read my complaint in intervention. It's there. And I invite your Honor to review it. Okay?

It was two things we talked about that I made clear.

We were not going to cover any rights to copyright -- okay? -to music. And also, nowhere in the settlement did I ever
agree, or Mr. Levy or Can't Stop agree, that we are saying,

"You know, it's a valid name. You can -- you know, we're not
going to ever challenge it. It's valid." No. Nowhere. But

what does stand on record for the Court -- and again, I invite your Honor to take a look at it -- is what I simply stated a moment ago, and that is that they have no valid trademark right to the "Kings of Disco," which, your Honor, is a totally separate, independent issue here.

So having said that, again, the Village People, you can't say to the Village People, "Oh, we know that you've been referred to as the 'Kings of Disco,' you know, forever, including in Rolling Stone Magazine." I can provide the Court with a hundred references to Village People being the Kings of Disco. The only purpose of Mr. Adelman's clients to want to use that term, your Honor, is to attempt to pass themselves off as Village People.

Now, that has been my position with this Court. And if you take a look at, again, my complaint in intervention, it is there. Nowhere have I ever agreed that I'm going to go along with that name.

So I just wanted to make that clear to the Court.

MR. LEVY: Your Honor, can I just say something?

MR. ADELMAN: Let me just address two things.

One is, it's perfectly -- since you read the transcript, your Honor, I'm not going to even go there. But nevertheless, I just want to make this small point, which is, trademark rights are very particular. My client has been using the name prior to this lawsuit. Village People never used the

name in the trademark context.

But it does seem to me that what is happening here is, Ms. Willis just threatened my clients. She just said, "They will never use the 'Kings of Disco' as long as I have something to say about it." That goes against everything that this settlement transcript was entered into in good faith and agreed to by everyone, including the rights holders themselves.

Ms. Willis is an intervenor. She's solely here at Judge Seibel's behest -- or agreement. She has no rights whatsoever of enforcement in the license agreement itself. The licensor is the one that has those rights. And as they have made plain -- I mean, now they're saying they take no position, but they helped us draft the settlement agreement based on the settlement transcript, and there are e-mails with Ms. Willis, in which she makes comments to it, and does seem to agree on things.

Nevertheless, the motion's before you.

That's all I have to say on that.

MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, I will say what I did say.

THE COURT: Wait. Wait. Mr. Levy's turn.

MR. LEVY: Your Honor, I know my letter was

(unintelligible). But years ago, when I was starting out, I

had a case with Judge Chin when he was a District Court Judge.

And the other -- I asked -- I wrote a letter to the judge about

something. The other side said, "It doesn't fit any motion.

What's he doing?" And Judge Chin said, "You know, I think what Mr. Levy's doing is, he's bringing in a situation which is awkward, where everyone is entrenched in fighting and everything else. And he knows that this thing should be resolved, and what he's hoping for is, he could find somebody who is a neutral person in good faith who will say, 'You know what? We have to have some common sense in here, and we're going to get this thing resolved.'" And we did.

And I go back to that. It doesn't happen all the time, but I guess, in writing my letter to the Court, that's my hope. We do not -- this case should have been over a long time ago. I don't disagree with the attorney for Sixuvus. You know, we worked on the settlement agreement. But then we get rip-sawed by the intervenor.

So we have a licensee who's complaining and threatening that we're not protecting the license rights. We have the former members of the group, who were certainly entitled to make reference to what they did in the past.

We're sitting here going like this is insane. And what we we're looking at is, no matter what the Court rules — and you've heard Ms. Willis speak now, and you've heard (unintelligible) — they're going to keep suing each other, and we're going to keep being brought in.

THE COURT: Oh, yes, there's no question about that.

MR. LEVY: And we don't want that.

THE COURT: No matter what the Court rules, there's no question that, at the very least, looking at past behavior,

Ms. Willis, on behalf her client, is going to pursue the matter in court. So I don't for a second believe that anything that I do is going to conclude the matter.

MR. ADEIMAN: Actually, your Honor, I disagree with that. I think that it -- while we're hoping that you find for us, since there was no real opposition to the transcript, as far as based under the law, if you do find that the settlement agreement is enforced and the settlement agreement becomes enforced, that will narrow -- and you've retained jurisdiction, that will narrow the field of scope that Ms. Willis can continue to try to barrage us with court filings and what-not. And that has a finite -- that will end. It's finite. There's appeals court that she could go to, but after that, that's it. And at some point --

Well, a long time ago, I was involved in a case in which the plaintiff -- the Court -- actually, the Southern District Court -- ordered the plaintiff to stop suing my client without their permission. Not suggesting that that's a necessity today. I'm just saying that I don't think the fear that Ms. Willis is trying to put into this Court, that she's going to sue us all into oblivion, should prevent us from concluding the matter in a fair and equitable manner, either today or with your decision.

Thank you.

MS. WILLIS: First of all, your Honor, I've not sued them, not once, not even one time. And nowhere near in any of the transcript where you see me talk about suing. But I can tell you this. Their concern is their concern. Their concern is that I'm not going to allow them to do -- continue to do what they're doing, and they're correct on that.

Now, I want to correct something Mr. Adelman -
THE COURT: How would you do that, other than suing
them? I don't understand. You just said, "I'm not suing them,
I haven't sued them, and I'm not threatening to sue them." And
then in the next sentence, you said, "But I'm not going to let
them continue to do it."

I mean, other than you walking onto the stage and tearing their costumes off, what other method do you have to stop them than to sue them? To say that you're not threatening to sue them and then say, "But I'm going to stop them," seems a little self-contradictory.

MS. WILLIS: What I said, your Honor, was that I have not sued them. Okay? Not once. That's what I said on the record. And your Honor can go and read the transcript. You'll see that.

All I'm saying here is that Mr. Adelman stated on the record that, "Oh, Ms. Willis is suing."

What are you talking about? I've not sued your client

yet.

You know, I'm hoping if this continues -- I mean, they've sued Can't Stop. They're way ahead of me. And Can't Stop sued them. So why aren't we talking about that? Their concern that -- again, that I'm defending against them. Okay? That's it. That's all they're concerned about. They don't want me to defend against them. Well, I'm here to let the Court know that I will, if I feel that they've stepped on my rights as the licensee. Okay? However, I've not done so. They make it appear that I have. I haven't. I've not got started yet on them. Okay? That's where we are. We're trying to get past this issue right now, so . . .

And he twisted my words on -- what I said with respect to the use of the name is that they have no valid trademark rights, your Honor, in that name. Okay? And I believe that the Trademark Trial and Appeals Board will agree with that.

But again, that's a separate issue. They're seeking the trademark. I've never agreed to go along with their name, not once, and I never will.

MR. ADELMAN: Just for the record, there is a valid trademark filed, and it has cleared on B. So I would disagree. Plus, we've used it in commerce at this point.

MS. WILLIS: Doesn't mean that it is valid.

MR. ADELMAN: It is a valid trademark.

THE COURT: Ms. Willis, I will give you lots of

24

25

opportunity to speak, but please don't interrupt each other. 2 MR. ADELMAN: Thank you, your Honor. 3 MS. WILLIS: It doesn't mean that it is valid, your 4 And it certainly does not mean that it is 5 incontestable. So come on. 6 MR. ADELMAN: Your Honor --7 THE COURT: But it is not in contest here. And in the 8 settlement conference in this case, the agreement, not with 9 regard to trademark or copyright, but the agreement to settle 10 this case included that Sixuvus could advertise, book 11 performances under, commercially exploit or otherwise use, the 12 name Kings of Disco, but without saying "Kings of Disco, 13 formerly Village People." They could say, "Kings of Disco," 14 "Kings of Disco, former members of Village People," "Kings of 15 Disco, formerly members of Village People." That was discussed 16 at length. 17 But this case is not intended to decide the trademark 18 issue in that regard. 19 I'm not so sure that we came to an agreement, 20 Mr. Adelman, about Mr. Willis using "Kings of Disco." I'm not 21 so sure that that part of the agreement was reciprocal. 22 were certain parts of the agreement that clearly were 23 reciprocal.

MR. ADELMAN: Whether it is or not in the transcript, we have the superior trademark law.

1 I think it's a separate trademark issue. THE COURT: 2 MR. ADELMAN: Yes. It may be. I'm just saying --3 THE COURT: It wouldn't be resolved in settlement 4 here. 5 MR. ADELMAN: I'm just saying that -- first of all, I 6 think that's a disparagement under the settlement transcript. 7 And you know, I think we have superior trademark rights, and they use "Capital 'K,' Capital 'D.'" It just shows the 8 9 purposeful nature of the intervenor, that they're -- you know, 10 again, here with my hands saying that there's issues. Tell me 11 what they are. I'm here to help resolve them. You've heard 12 the intervenor saying, "No matter what happens in the world, I 13 am going to stop them." 14 MS. WILLIS: That's not what I said, your Honor. 15 MR. ADELMAN: That's my characterization of it. 16 MS. WILLIS: Well, thank you. MR. ADELMAN: That's what I hear. 17 18 MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, look. If they lack the 19 trademark, and if they're saying they'd like to do -- go along 20 with the spirit of the settlement, why not amend the trademark 21 to state "Kings of Disco, former members of Village People"? 22 That's what we talked about there, and they know it. They're 23 attempting to get to the broad tag of just simply "Kings of

Disco." And that's why it would never stand in the trademark

24

25

office.

THE COURT: Well, I have to disagree. The transcript reflects that the discussion was that they could use "Kings of Disco" standing alone, or "Kings of Disco, former members of Village People," or "Kings of Disco, formerly members of Village People." So long as the "Kings of Disco" was at least as large as anything else or potentially larger than the reference to the Village People, that was discussed at length, and agreed to. So I'm not quite sure that I can agree with you.

I think what I'm going to need to do, unfortunately — and it's not something that I want to do, but I think, in response to Mr. Levy's letter to the Court, I do need to see whatever recordings there are that are relevant to this issue; essentially, to make sure that any concerns about performance, if they are touched upon in the transcript of the settlement discussion, are incorporated into what may be a final and enforceable settlement document. I haven't come to a complete decision on that, but we are working toward that. But I don't want to do it here in open court.

Is it possible, Mr. Adelman, for you to make those available for us?

MR. ADELMAN: Not only would I be happy to make them available for you, I would like to send -- we have compiled, though it's not in judge form, as I would call it, we would like to send you the breakdown and the explanations that we had

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

prepared to discuss in court, if Mr. Levy had been allowed to bring his projector. So I would like to present both of those things to you. And I think that's -- yes, that's fine. THE COURT: Of course, with service on Ms. Willis --MR. ADELMAN: Yes. THE COURT: -- and Mr. Levy --MR. ADELMAN: Absolutely. THE COURT: -- and they can respond in any way that they'd like. MR. LEVY: No objection on our part. Maybe there's other concerts. You know, when we --THE COURT: I don't mean to interrupt, but I really don't want to have to watch more concerts than are absolutely necessary. MR. LEVY: Okay. So then just those two. MR. ADELMAN: Yes. MR. LEVY: When we brought the lawsuit, I remember Judge Seibel (unintelligible) one, we terminate the contract after all these years so abruptly. And at the trial -- like my client's son runs the company now, spoke, I think, very practically about your clients. And we all felt bad about it, but we said, "Look. My client is an 85-year-old man who's been in litigation for almost a decade with the Willises, and he

just couldn't take it anymore." And the idea was that we just

said, "Okay. Sixuvus had their run. We'll give it to the willises now. Just leave us alone. Eighty-five; I have a couple of good years left of my life. Leave me alone."

And we find ourselves in a situation where we just —
they should all live and be well and play to their own
audiences, and it's fine. But this constant fighting — and we
keep getting dragged into it, because like well, we're the
licensor. What are we supposed to do? What we're supposed to
do is, can't you guys work it out? I mean, and they never do,
and we want out of the case already.

MR. ADELMAN: We actually did work it out. We have a settlement transcript.

I appreciate what Mr. Levy said, but he's standing there going, "Boo-hoo, poor me," when he's not controlling his own licensee. He knows that we came to an agreement. He has control of the licensee. That's their agreement. So I just want to add that I don't think it's -- I don't think that he's being dragged into the middle. I think he's being dragged one way. I have my --

I'm just going to say this. I don't think Mr. Levy wrote this letter.

MR. LEVY: No, that's not true.

MR. ADELMAN: I could be wrong about that.

MS. WILLIS: We have an agreement to agree, and the Second Circuit will have a lot to say about that. That's all I

can say on that.

But I can tell you this. Again, I don't know what Mr. Adelman is talking about, because there hasn't been anything from me. I haven't communicated with him. I haven't filed anything with the Court since the time of -- what are they talking about? Is he afraid of something? But there has been a letter from Mr. Levy here on this. And there's been plenty from their side. So where's the beef? as they used to say. I don't know what he's talking about. He's afraid of what's about to happen.

THE COURT: Look. Look. Let me just --

MR. ADELMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I do want to comment, Ms. Willis.

You had sent a letter to Judge Seibel about -- saying something about if a decision isn't made within a certain period of time that -- I don't even know -- that somebody wins. But we don't know where that comes from, because there's no such rule in the federal courts. There are certain consequences in criminal cases if decisions aren't rendered in 30 days, the passage of the speedy trial clock, for instance. But it doesn't apply in civil cases. So I don't want you to think we ignored your letter to that effect.

MS. WILLIS: Oh, absolutely. I agree, your Honor.

And in other words, that was my communication. That's it. I wanted to get clarification, but I've not done anything.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Adelman, your turn. MR. ADELMAN: No, actually, your Honor, I just wanted to say that I'm not going to make any comment in response, because I think your Honor sees right through it. But nevertheless, I would like clarification on one item, and that is, I'm going to send you the videos. How would you like them? THE COURT: On regular readable disks. MR. ADELMAN: That's fine. THE COURT: And what we will do is, we will have our IT staff just confirm that there's no bad stuff in it before we watch it. MR. ADELMAN: No. Absolutely. That's why I asked. And we'll have that delivered to you. THE COURT: Good. MR. ADELMAN: I'd like to ask, due to my schedule -and I want to put this together properly -- if we could have a week to get that to you. THE COURT: Sure. MR. ADELMAN: Thank you, your Honor. THE COURT: Sure. MS. WILLIS: Your Honor, why -- it was -- your Honor, it was the plaintiff's side that requested this hearing, and wanted to introduce the evidence. Why should we trust this edited video from them? We have the unedited. So I would like

to provide that to have Mr. Levy --

THE COURT: You may send whatever you'd like, Ms. Willis.

MS. WILLIS: Thank you.

THE COURT: And Mr. Levy can send whatever he'd like.

I'm not -- he had offered at the outset to send it.

So I was just taking him up on that offer. But I'm certainly not going to prevent you from sending it. Lord knows we've been seeing on the news about what happens with edited videos.

MR. ADELMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So I wouldn't want to be looking at something that wasn't complete and accurate. On the other hand, I'm not going to pretend that I'm going to be watching hours and hours of this concert. No disrespect, but it's not my favorite music in the world.

MR. ADELMAN: The way that I'm -- the way that we've set up what I'm going to call the "dialogue" is that we're going to give you time stamp numbers. So the hour-long video, you know, to the extent you want to watch whatever you want, you could probably get through it in under ten minutes. And the five-minute video, you could probably get finished in under five minutes.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ADELMAN: So we're cognizant of the Court's time, and we want to make this is as easy as possible.

THE COURT: All right. And you may send me whatever you'd like. If you want it to be just portions for whatever reason, just identify what you're sending. All right? Fair? Very good. Thank you, everyone. We will try to get you something as soon as possible. MR. ADELMAN: Appreciate that, your Honor. THE COURT: Have a nice holiday on Monday. ALL COUNSEL: Thank you.